| | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
|--|--|--|
| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary | 09/849,307 | BURNS ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| ! | Clifford H Knoll | 2112 |
| All Participants: | Status of Application: <u>Allowed</u> | |
| (1) <u>Clifford H Knoll</u> . | (3) | |
| (2) Ram Soundararajan (#53832). | (4) | |
| Date of Interview: 17 March 2005 | Time: | |
| Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ A Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description: | applicant's representative) | |
| Part I. | | |
| Rejection(s) discussed: | | |
| Claims discussed: 30-45 | | |
| Prior art documents discussed: Leach | | |
| Part II. | | |
| SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE C See Continuation Sheet | GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT | WAS DISCUSSED: |
| Part III. | | |
| ☑ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separative directly resulted in the allowance of the application of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separation of all issues. A brief su | on. The examiner will provide a variate record of the substance of | written summary of the substance the interview |
| | | |
| | | |
| ALODA O COM | | |
| MARK H. RINEHART SUPERVISORY EXTENT EXAMINED | | |
| TWO CON JET (FR 2/00) | | |
| (Examiner/SPE Signature) (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate) | | |

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Feature not taught by prior art as argued by Applicant was persuasive. This feature was present in all independent claims, except it was found absent from claim 30. Agreement was reached to amend claim 30 with the feature as recited in claim 31, subsequently cancelling claim 31. Claims dependent on 31 to be amended to depend on 30. Amendments to be entered by Examiner's Amendment.